



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,928	02/17/2004	John L. Moss	S2-002AUS	9369
36543	7590	12/18/2007	EXAMINER	
S2 SECURITY CORPORATION			MOORTHY, ARAVIND K	
50 Speen St.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 300			2131	
Framingham, MA 01701				

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/779,928	MOSS ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aravind K. Moorthy	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *see attachment*.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the communications filed on 11 January 2006.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 1-20 have been rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The examiner has considered the information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on 17 February 2004 and 11 January 2006.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: misspelling. The word “one” has been misspelled as “on”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brooks et al US 2003/0210139 A1.**

As to claim 1, Brooks et al discloses an integrated security system operating over a network comprising:

a network security controller [0038] coupled to the network comprising:

a relational database including portal objects and related resources represented in at least one table in the relational database [0031]; at least one network node comprising:

a local database coupled to the network adapted to receive predetermined resource information from the relational database [0031];

an event generator coupled to the local database to provide at least one portal event in response to the predetermined resource information received by the local database [0037]; and

a finite state portal controller coupled to the network and the event generator for providing at least one of an action and a global event in response to the at least one portal event [0046].

As to claim 2, Brooks et al discloses that the event generator comprises a protocol normalizer [0032].

As to claim 3, Brooks et al discloses that the event generator further comprises a data stream converter coupled to the protocol normalizer adapted to receive data from a field device [0032].

As to claim 4, Brooks et al discloses that the field device is a reader module [0038].

As to claim 5, Brooks et al discloses that the event generator comprises:

a supervision controller [0042];

an I/O controller coupled to the supervision controller and adapted to receive signals from an input extension [0042].

As to claim 6, Brooks et al discloses a network node controller coupled to the database and coupled to the at least one network node [0031].

As to claim 7, Brooks et al discloses that the network security controller further comprises an extensible markup language generator and the at least one network node local database downloads an extensible markup language representation of the predetermined resource information [0035].

As to claim 8, Brooks et al discloses that the extensible markup language representation comprises XML [0035].

As to claim 9, Brooks et al discloses that the at least one global event is represented using an extensible markup language representation [0035].

As to claim 10, Brooks et al discloses that the extensible markup language representation comprises XML [0035].

As to claim 12, Brooks et al discloses a method to normalize an access control event comprising:

converting a field device signal representing the access control event to a data stream [0032];

normalizing the data stream to provide at least one portal event [0032]; and

processing the at least one portal event in a finite state portal controller to provide at least one of a local action and a global event [0037].

As to claim 13, Brooks et al discloses the method further comprising:

storing predetermined resource information from at least one resource table of a relational database in a local database [0031]; and

wherein normalizing the data stream comprises mapping the field device signal to the at least one portal event using the stored predetermined resource information [0032].

As to claim 14, Brooks et al discloses using an extensible markup language representation for the predetermined resource information [0035].

As to claim 15, Brooks et al discloses that mapping the field device signal comprises at least one of:

detecting a state change in the field device signal to provide a portal even [0044]; and

translating the field device signal to provide a portal event [0044].

As to claim 16, Brooks et al discloses processing the at least one local action in response to determining that the field is a module [0039].

As to claim 17, Brooks et al discloses a method to process an access control event from an application extension comprising:

supervising the application extension to provide at least one portal event [0032]; and

processing the at least one portal event in a finite state portal controller to provide at least one of a local action and a global event [0037].

As to claim 18, Brooks et al discloses the method further comprising:

1 17. storing predetermined resource information from at least one resource table of a relational database in a local database [0035]; and

mapping an application extension state change signal to provide the at least one portal event [0035].

As to claim 19, Brooks et al discloses using an extensible markup language representation for the predetermined resource information [0035].

As to claim 20, Brooks et al discloses the method further comprising:

receiving a command [0039-0046];
mapping the command using the predetermined resource information to provide a command portal event [0039-0046];
processing the command portal event in the finite state portal controller to provide at least one local action [0039-0046]; and
converting the local action into a local action field device signal directed to a selected application extension [0039-0046].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks et al US 2003/0210139 A1 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Elwahab et al US 2001/0034754 A1.

As to claim 11, Brooks et al does not teach that the network security controller further comprises a web server coupled to the network and the database to provide at least one user interface to the integrated security system in at least one browser.

Elwahab et al teaches a web server coupled to the network and the database to provide at least one user interface to the integrated security system in at least one browser [0025-0026].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Brooks et al so that the network security controller would have comprised a web server coupled to the network and the database to provide at least one user interface to the integrated security system in at least one browser.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Brooks et al by the teaching of Elwahab et al because it allows a user to gain access and control devices without a computer having a specific application software loaded thereon [0007].

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Aravind K Moorthy
December 12, 2007

CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

